



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**MAILED**

**NOV 17 2010**

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

CADENCE DESIGN SYSTEMS, INC.  
C/O/ HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP  
10 ST. JAMES AVENUE  
BOSTON, MA 02116-3889

In re Application of :  
Eric Yang, et al. :  
Application No. 09/854,306 : **ON PETITION**  
Filed: May 11, 2001 :  
Attorney Docket No.: 120719.05005/01PA003US01 :

This is a decision on the petition, filed September 9, 2009, to revive the above-identified application under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b).

The petition is not signed by a patent practitioner of record. However, in accordance with 37 CFR 1.34(a), the signature of Jeffrey T. Placker appearing on the petition shall constitute a representation to the United States Patent and Trademark Office that he is authorized to represent the particular party on whose behalf he acts.

The petition is GRANTED.

The above-identified application became abandoned as a result of petitioner's failure to take appropriate action in a timely manner after the decision of July 30, 2009 by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed on October 27, 2009. On September 9, 2009, the present petition was filed.

The petition satisfies the requirements of 37 CFR 1.137(b) in that petitioner has supplied (1) the reply in the form of an amendment; (2) the petition fee of \$1,620; and (3) an adequate statement of unintentional delay<sup>1</sup>.

The application is being referred to Technology Center AU 3689 for appropriate action by the Examiner in the normal course of business on the amendment received September 9, 2010.

Telephone inquiries concerning this matter may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3204.

Sherry D. Brinkley  
Petitions Examiner  
Office of Petitions

<sup>1</sup> 37 CFR 1.137(b)(3) requires a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. While the statement is not made by an attorney of record at the time of abandonment, such statement is being treated as having been made as the result of a reasonable inquiry into the facts and circumstances of such delay. See 37 CFR 10.18(b) and Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice, 62 Fed. Reg. 53131, 53178 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 63, 103 (October 21, 1997). In the event that such an inquiry has not been made, petitioner must make such an inquiry. If such inquiry results in the discovery that it is not correct that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional, petitioner must notify the Office.